

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 15 – 17 have been cancelled without prejudice to reduce the issues. Claims 1 – 9 are pending in this Application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1 – 9 and 15 – 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 15 – 17 have been cancelled. The claim language that caused the rejection has been deleted from independent Claim 1. This rejection is thereby rendered moot.

Claims 1 – 9 and 15 – 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement and rendering the claim indefinite because of insufficient antecedent basis for the term “the output”. Claims 15 – 17 have been cancelled. The claim language that caused the rejection has been deleted from independent Claim 1. This rejection is thereby rendered moot.

Claims 15 – 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement and rendering the claim indefinite. These claims have been cancelled and thus this rejection is rendered moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 – 5 , 9, and 15 – 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chang et al. (Patent No. US 6,556,724). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicants' exemplary claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the invention sets forth a method for configuring and dynamically adapting an application sharing system. The method comprises the step of providing at least one of the plurality of computers with a plurality of system components adapted to provide feedback to the shared application. (Specification [0020]). The method further includes the steps of determining a preference for a shared application, and monitoring by the one of the computers a feedback generated by the one of the system components to determine whether the system component is performing satisfactorily, (for example Specification [0031]), the feedback indicating the performance of the component relative to the determined preference. Further claimed is the step of configuring the one of the system components in response to the determined preference and the monitored feedback, said configuring comprising adjusting an algorithm used to implement the system component, the configuring of the system component causing an adjustment in the performance of the shared application for a plurality of computers sharing the application. (For example Specification [0028]).

Chang, in general overview and in direct contrast to the Applicants' claimed invention, describes a system wherein the host application executes independently of the requirements of the clients. Chang presents an image collaboration system wherein a host computer provides a source resolution independent image language to client computers. (Chang Fig. 5, 320, Col. 9, lines 45 – 47.) Specifically in the case of Chang, each client computer sends to a server calculated coordinates needed to render an image based on its client specific resolution. (Chang Fig. 5, 340, Col. 9 lines 50 - 54). The server sends each client the coefficients it needs to render the source resolution independent image from the host. The other clients are not affected by the requirements of any single client. This is the point of Chang.

Addressing the limitations of the Applicants' invention with particularity: first of all, the Applicants clarify that claimed method includes the step of "providing at least one of the plurality of computers with a plurality of system components, one of the system components adapted to provide feedback to the shared application". The Office Action equates the clients of Chang with the claimed "computers", and the server of Chang with the claimed component. Chang does not teach or suggest any clients including a plurality of servers, or any other components. Thus Chang fails to teach or suggest this claimed step.

Secondly, the Applicants address what is meant by the claimed step of "monitoring". In support of the Applicants' claimed step of "monitoring", the Office Action at page 5 refers to Chang: fig. 5, col. 9, lines 50 – 60, noting "that the image server 220 transmits the requested transform data at the designated coefficient coordinates to the participating client". The Applicants respectfully assert that transmitting requested data to a client is not monitoring by the client.

The Applicants specifically claim "monitoring by the one of the computers a feedback generated by the one of the system components to determine whether the system component is performing satisfactorily, said feedback indicating the performance of the component relative to the determined preference". The Office Action equates the claimed "preference" with transform data calculated by the clients of Chang. The Office Action equates the claimed "one of the computers" with the client of Chang. The Office Action then equates the claimed "system component" with the image server of Chang. Then the Office Action states that "monitoring by one of the computers a feedback generated by the one of the system components, said feedback indicating the performance of the component relative to the determined preference" is taught, apparently, by the client of Chang receiving coefficient coordinates that it requested from the

server of Chang, “said feedback indicating the performance of the component relative to the determined preference”.

In Chang, the coordinates necessary to render the image by the client (chosen as the claimed “the computer”) are sent to the server. The server (chosen as the claimed “the component”) responds the request with the coefficients necessary to render the image. The client receives the coefficients from the server. The Office Action has chosen to characterize the reception of the response by the client from the server in Chang as “monitoring a feedback”. Thus a response to a request is “monitoring of feedback”.

The claim language now further requires “monitoring by the one of the computers a feedback generated by the one of the system components to determine whether the system component is performing satisfactorily”. The clients of Chang clearly do not monitor the server to see whether it is performing anything satisfactorily.

The claim language then further requires “said feedback indicating the performance of the component relative to the determined preference”. The Office Action states that Chang teaches this. Particularly, the Office Action states at page 5, “noted that the image server 220 transmits the requested transform data at the designated coefficient coordinates to the participating client”. In other words, the server of Chang transmits to the client of Chang what the Client requested. So, in summary, the logic of the Office Action is that the reception of the response to a request in Chang is “monitoring of feedback”, and the sending of a response to a request is “feedback indicating the performance of the component relative to the determined preference”.

The Applicants respectfully assert that receiving a response to a request, as the client receives its coefficients in Chang, is not monitoring feedback. Further, receiving the requested

coefficients does not indicate anything about the performance of the server of Chang, much less as to whether it is performing satisfactorily. Thus Chang fails to teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed step of "monitoring by the one of the computers a feedback generated by the one of the system components to determine whether the system component is performing satisfactorily, said feedback indicating the performance of the component relative to the determined preference".

Chang further fails to teach or suggest the claimed step of "configuring the one of the system components in response to the determined preference and the monitored feedback, said configuring comprising adjusting an algorithm used to implement the system component, the configuring of the system component causing an adjustment in the performance of the shared application for each computer sharing the application". Since the claimed monitored feedback is not taught, this step is not taught.

Furthermore, Applicants specifically claim that the configuring of the system component causes "an adjustment in the performance of the shared application for a plurality of computers sharing the application."

Further clarified is that, in accordance with the claimed invention, the performance of the shared application is adjusted for a number of computers that are sharing it. In other words, according to an embodiment, if one computer monitors a component and configures a component in response to a determined preference and monitored feedback, the configuration of that system component, which is adapted to provide feedback to the shared application, causes an adjustment in the performance of the shared application for each computer sharing the application (Specification [0028] "all users receive updates at the same rate"). To clarify, in accordance with an embodiment, if one computer configures a component to cause the application to adjust its speed or resolution, all the other computers are affected by this adjustment.

In Chang, the host application is client independent. Even when new images are sent to the server in the source resolution independent language according to Figure 8, the server will distribute coefficients, and each client will pick the ones it needs. The performance of the shared application remains the same for each client in Chang, regardless of whether it changes for any given client. That is the point of Chang.

Thus, Chang fails to teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed method for configuring and dynamically adapting an application sharing system, including the steps of "monitoring by the one of the computers a feedback generated by the one of the system components to determine whether the system component is performing satisfactorily, said feedback indicating the performance of the component relative to the determined preference", and of "configuring the one of the system components in response to the determined preference and the monitored feedback, said configuring comprising adjusting an algorithm used to implement the system component, the configuring of the system component causing an adjustment in the performance of the shared application for each computer sharing the application".

The Applicants therefore assert that Claims 1 – 5 and 9 are not anticipated by Chang and are allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 6 - 8 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Boston et al. (PGPUB: US 2004/0101272). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6 – 8 depend on Claim 1. Claim 17 has been cancelled. Boston adds nothing further to solve the deficiencies of Chang as discussed above. Thus Chang and Boston, taken together or in part, fail to teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention as set forth in claims 1 – 9. The Applicants therefore respectfully assert that claims 6 – 8 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and arguments made herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and request early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the Applicants' representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-2003, or at the undersigned's cell, (617) 901-6786.

Date: August 26, 2010
Reg. No.: 37,946

Fax No.: (508) 303-0005
Tel. No.: (508) 303-2003

Respectfully submitted,
/Mary M. Steubing/
Mary M. Steubing
Attorney for Applicants
Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP
5 Mount Royal Avenue
Marlborough, MA 01752